Appl. No. 10/538,112 Amdt. dated Oct. 16, 2006 Reply to Office action of Sept. 13, 2006

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the present amendment and reconsideration of the present application.

This amendment is submitted to present the claims in better form for reconsideration by the Examiner or for consideration on appeal.

Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 14, 17 and 18 remain in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 16 have been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that
Claims 9-11 are allowed and Claims 3, 17 and 18 would be
allowable if amended to overcome the Examiner's objection
to them as being dependent on a rejected base claim.
Applicant gratefully acknowledges this indication of
allowable subject matter and has amended Claims 3, 17 and
18 accordingly.

In the Office action, Claims 4, 6, 7, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 6 and 14 were rejected only under §112. (The other Claims are rejected as anticipated by JP 07-220692-A (Kawakatsu) or as unpatentable over Kawakatsu in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0063503

Appl. No. 10/538,112 Amdt. dated Oct. 16, 2006 Reply to Office action of Sept. 13, 2006

(Tsuda).) In response, Claim 6 has been amended to incorporate Claim 1 and Claim 4, from which Claim 6 formerly depended, and recite that the second reference to "coating" is to a second coating. Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate Claim 1 and Claim 5, from which Claim 14 formerly depended, and to recite that the second reference to "coating" is to a second coating.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome. Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of Claims 6 and 14 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kawakatsu. In response, Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant may submit these or similar claims in a divisional application.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakatsu in view of Tsuda. In response, Claims 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant may submit these or similar claims in a divisional application.

Appl. No. 10/538,112 Amdt. dated Oct. 16, 2006 Reply to Office action of Sept. 13, 2006

The specification has been amended at page 1, lines 15-24 to incorporate Claim 1, instead of incorporating Claim 1 by reference.

In addition, in order to put those claims in better form, Claims 3, 6, 9 and 14 have been amended by removing the reference numerals and Claim 9 by changing "characterized in that" to "wherein." A typographical error - repetition of the phrase "characterized in that" - has also been corrected in Claim 9.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 14, 17 and 18 are now all in allowable form and that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any informalities remain, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned in order to expedite allowance.

Please charge any fee deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Keegan, Reg. 50,145

Attorney

(914) 333-9669 October 17, 2006